UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,141	01/03/2002	Radhika Aggarwal	RSW920010112US1 - 7	2419

46320   7590   01/28/2008

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/041,141	AGGARWAL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thu V. Huynh	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 October 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE and amendment filed on 10/29/07 to

application filed on 01/03/2002.

2.   Claims 1 and 6 are amended.

3.   Claims 1-10 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims.

4.   All rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by the

amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Upton et al., US 2003/0105884 A1, provisional filed 10/2001, in view of Radtke et al.,

US 2002/0113810 A1, filed 12/22/2000, Jeffries et al., US 6,094,529, filed 12/1996 as supplied

by the Applicants in IDS filed 01/03/2002, and "Instant HTML", Homer et al., copyright

1997, pages 88-101.

Regarding independent claim 1, Upton teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62; user fill-out data and submits an html form, validating data in submitted form to detect invalid data);

- inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message next to each erroneous field. This inherently disclose inserting a text row next to erroneous field in the html form);

- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected error text in said row (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message next to each erroneous field); and

- serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62).

Upton does not explicitly disclose that said row having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag; generating an error code specific to the error type of the validation error; comparing the error code to an index of a plurality of error codes, the index including a corresponding error text, respectively, for each of the plurality of error codes.

Radtke teaches generating an error code specific to the error type of the validation error; comparing the error code to an index of a plurality of error codes, the index including a corresponding error text, respectively, for each of the plurality of error codes (Radtke, [0021]-[0022]; TABLE 1; using Boolean logic to provide appropriate error text message among multiple error text messages in a table according to the error type).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Radtke's teaching and Upton's teaching to provide appropriate error text message according to the type of error, since the combination would have provided the user with helpful information for correcting the erroneous input.

Jeffries teaches text of error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries' visual indicator in error message into Upton's error message in html form to insert error text message having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form. It is also noted that highlighting error data or error text field in an html form as a visual indicator for the user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor within a page so that, when we load the page, that part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, "Anchors Within A Page" section; placing the anchor tag with name "dalmation" in section Dalmatians to directly scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an

anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate to said input element, since this

would have allowed when the user submit the html form, error part of the html form is

automatically scrolled into view Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as.

This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton does not explicitly disclose

inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual

indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Jeffries' glyph visual indicator in error message into

Upton's error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since

this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html

form.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject

claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form

in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the anchor tag place

before the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, "Using Anchors in Your

Pages" section).

.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an

anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element,

since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the

html form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a

correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is

directly provided.

Claims 6-7 and 10 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims

1-2 and 5, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

7.   **Claims 3-4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Upton in view of Radtke, Jeffries and Homer as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and
further in view of Hartman, US 6,615,226 B1, filed 09/1997.**

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches

display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above.

However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form

contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is

determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said

multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple

view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Upton to includes the steps of determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since this would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple or/and complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs from other colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row in claim 1 above. Upton does not explicitly disclose that said position is proximate to but below said input element.

Hartman teaches displaying error message in close proximity but below said input element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman and Upton to provide the error message on many different position proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Claims 8-9 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 3-4, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

8.   **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over **Upton** et al., US 2003/0105884 A1, provisional filed 10/2001, in view of **Burkett** et al.,

US 6,635,089, filed 01/13/1999, **Jeffries** et al., US 6,094,529, filed 12/1996 as supplied by the

Applicants in IDS filed 01/03/2002, and "Instant HTML", **Homer** et al., copyright 1997,

pages 88-101.

Regarding independent claim 1, Upton teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value

    provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Upton, col.5,

    paragraph 62; user fill-out data and submits an html form, validating data in

    submitted form to detect invalid data);

- inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said

    input element (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message

    next to each erroneous field. This inherently disclose inserting a text row next to

    erroneous field in the html form);

- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected

    error text in said row (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error

    message next to each erroneous field); and

- serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Upton,

    col.5, paragraph 62).

Upton does not explicitly disclose that said row having a background color which differs

from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in

said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a

response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag; generating an error

code specific to the error type of the validation error; comparing the error code to an index of a

plurality of error codes, the index including a corresponding error text, respectively, for each of

the plurality of error codes.

Burkett teaches generating an error code specific to the error type of the validation error;

comparing the error code to an index of a plurality of error codes, the index including a

corresponding error text, respectively, for each of the plurality of error codes (Burkett, col.17,

lines 42-50; "an error message identifier is used to select an appropriate in message index).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Burkett's teaching and Upton's teaching to provide

appropriate error text message according to the type of error, since the combination would have

provided the user with helpful information for correcting the erroneous input.

Jeffries teaches text of error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the

background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Jeffries' visual indicator in error message into Upton's

error message in html form to insert error text message having a background color which differs

from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text, since this would have

provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form. It is also

noted that highlighting error data or error text field in an html form as a visual indicator for the

user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor within a page so that, when we load the page, that part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, "Anchors Within A Page" section; placing the anchor tag with name "dalmation" in section Dalmatians to directly scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate to said input element, since this would have allowed when the user submit the html form, error part of the html form is automatically scrolled into view Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton does not explicitly disclose inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries' glyph visual indicator in error message into Upton's error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the anchor tag place before the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, "Using Anchors in Your Pages" section).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element, since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the html form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Claims 6-7 and 10 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 1-2 and 5, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

9.   **Claims 3-4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upton in view of Burkett, Jeffries and Homer as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Hartman, US 6,615,226 B1, filed 09/1997.**

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above. However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is

determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said

multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple

view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Upton to includes the steps of

determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said

multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since this

would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple or/and

complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches

inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to

said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs from other

colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row in claim 1 above. Upton does not

explicitly disclose that said position is proximate to but below said input element.

Hartman teaches displaying error message in close proximity but below said input

element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Hartman and Upton to provide the error message on many

different position proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below

or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Claims 8-9 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 3-4,

respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Upton does not teaches generating an error code and the claim

invention directed to selecting the error message based upon an error code, which is based upon

the error type of the validation error (Remarks, page 7).

However, Radtke and/or Burkett teach such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

French et al., US 6,826,591 B2, filed 12/15/2000, teaches determining appropriate

translated text message using message ID.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thu V. Huynh
January 19, 2008